DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 458 794 FL 026 942

AUTHOR Kim, Youngsang
TITLE Advanced Studies in EFL Teaching.
PUB DATE 2001-00-00
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communicative Competence (Languages); *English for Special Purposes; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Korean; Language Attitudes; Language Planning; *Language Proficiency; Second Language Instruction; Second Language Learning; Student Evaluation; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *South Korea

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the importance in Korea of learning to speak English proficiently, and describes a 16-week course designed to advance such proficiency. The paper begins with a general description of the importance of English in the curriculum of Korean higher education, and how important it is to obtain and keep professional employment, which is why learning to speak English proficiently is considered so important in Korea. The course is then described in some detail, including the listing of 25 books and textbooks used in it. A week-by-week description is provided, including weekly objectives and suggested activities. The paper provides a literature review of the major recent works in the field English as a foreign language teaching. (Contains 38 references.) (KFT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 458 794

Advanced Studies in EFL Teaching[1]

Youngsang Kim

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Youngsang Kim

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL026942

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Advanced Studies in EFL Teaching[1]

Youngsang Kim

Since English as a Foreign Language (EFL) entered into the formal curriculum of Korean schools, more than five decades have passed. Some students think of English as their favorite subject, whereas others hate it. Regardless of students' attitudes toward or their preferences for English, all Korean students have to learn English as one of the required subjects, while they are in schools from elementary school (third grade) to university (first year to second year). This indicates that Korean students have been spending quite a long time learning English while they attend schools. What about their English proficiency in general after receiving such a long education? Why do so many Korean students and adults make it a rule to pay a visit to private English language institutes, called "Yenge Hakwon," after school and work?[2] Are they merely eager to upgrade their English proficiency level at which their English is near native speakers'? Each of these questions can be answered separately. It may be that Korean students and adults are in desperate need of improving their English proficiency to meet the requirements imposed on them. Investing time, effort, and financial resources

---

[1]It is assumed that I am responsible for developing a 16-week course in a Korean university. In order to develop the course in EFL instruction, I tentatively titled the course Advanced studies in EFL teaching. This 3 credit hour course is offered to the EFL teachers and graduate students who work or will work in secondary schools.

[2]As of 1997, it was reported that 70% of elementary students and 50% of middle school and high school students have taken private lessons or attended "hakwon" (Lartigue Jr., 2000; The Dong-A Ilbo, May 29, 2000). In a national survey conducted by the Ministry of Education in 1999, 62% of all Korean elementary students have received private schooling (The Joongang Ilbo, April 27, 2000). According to the author's recent survey, 257 10th graders out of 380 (67.6%) and 223 11th graders out of 400 (55.8%) have attended private English language institutions in Pusan, the second biggest city in Korea (in a personal communication with Dong-Ho Kang).

FL026942

to achieve a certain goal is not a bad thing. Rather, such an investment is commendable in some cases.

However, we need to reflect on whether such an investment has any good rationale. When one is equipped with a good command of English after the completion of formal education, one's future is brighter on the one hand. On the other hand, when one graduates from schools with insufficient English proficiency, one's future is not so bright. In the latter case, English functions as a barrier to one's future. Even those who have already reached high positions in private companies or governmental offices, but who have not demonstrated enough English proficiency in terms of oral English and written exams are hard put to maintain their current positions.[3] That's why so many students attend private English language institutes in preparation for the future and why so many adults visit private institutes as well.[4]

What is EFL education like in schools? This question definitely needs to be answered for our EFL students who have spent many years studying English while they are in school. There must be something wrong with our current EFL instruction practices in schools, given that our EFL students have spent more than 10 years

---

[3]English is now equated with a means of survival. Government offices as well as private companies announced the plan that their high-ranking staff members will be excluded from consideration for promotion unless they show English proficiency (The Dong-A Ilbo, February 29, 2000).

[4]The number of adults attending private English language institutes is not available. However, citing a "Yenge Hakwon" (private English language institute) located in Seoul, a Korean newspaper recently reported that the number of adults registered in that institute increased by more than 30%, compared to last year and that as early as 8 o'clock in the morning, 20 lecture rooms were filled with college students, salary men working for companies, government officials, lawyers, and medical doctors (The Dong-A Ilbo, February 29, 2000).

studying English while in school and that most of them do not have English proficiency. This has led EFL students and many adults to attend private English language institutes (Park, 2000; MacDonald, 2000). Of course, it is not fair to attribute every failure to EFL teachers. They have been limited by a variety of institutional constraints under which they feel helpless and powerless, and they have not been educated on the way their teaching could lead to the development of EFL students' communicative competence when they were in school themselves. As a result, our EFL students are wasting a tremendous amount of time, money, and effort, in spite of receiving long periods of formal EFL instruction at schools (Kim, 2000). Kim also points out the problem that current English teaching practices in Korea are ineffective and emphasizes the necessity of improving such ineffective English teaching practices in terms of international competition.

Governmental documents issued by the Ministry of Education contain a provision which explicitly states that one of the purposes of EFL learning and teaching is developing EFL learners' balanced communicative abilities in all four skill areas. However, such a provision and current practice in EFL education differ. Though the Government continues to call for reform in EFL education, no visible investments are being made to lend support to such call. Rather, such a call for reform has been perceived as an election promise. There is no continuity in supporting EFL education. Whenever a new cabinet member is appointed as Minister of Education, he or she has made many promises to support EFL education in terms of financial investment and teacher training. Though there are some investments at the onset of the appointment, they have not lasted long upon the appointment of another cabinet member in the Ministry of Education. Such a tradition has marked a succession of vicious cycles in our

EFL education, with only 2 to 3 years of short-term effect, pushing our students from schools to private institutes (Park, 2000; Song, 2000).

As the world is becoming a global village, the role of English is ever increasing. At this point, we need to put our EFL education on the right track. EFL learning in school settings should serve as a motivator for further investment in the development of English proficiency, after our students leave schools. In light of the years our EFL learners spend learning English and their English proficiency attained from school learning, Korean EFL teacher training is desperately needed to help EFL learners develop English skills without forcing them to wander around looking for private English language institutes.

The following course is offered to graduate students and those who teach EFL in secondary schools. The requirements of the course are two short papers (30% of the grade), teaching activity (30%), and final group project with class presentation (40%). Each participant in this class is responsible for readings for the day specified.

Textbooks

Brown, H. D. (1994). Principles of language learning and teaching (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (1994). Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Reading packet

Bialystok, E. (1982). On the relationship between knowing and using linguistic forms. Applied Linguistics, 3, 181-206.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and communication (pp. 2-27). New York: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1, 1-47.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6, 5-35.

Cho, M-W. (1998). An autonomy on bubble-free EFL. English Teaching, 53(2).

Haswell, R. H. (1983). Minimal marking. College English, 45, 600-604.

Kung, N-H. (1996). The communicative approach to Korean college English. English Teaching, 51(1).

Lee, S-H. (1996). Classification systems of language learning activities in communicative language teaching materials. English Teaching, 51(1), 119-134.

Lee, Y-S. (1997). Choikuen enepyeongkaui yenkuwa ironjek paykyong [A current trend in language testing and theories]. English Teaching, 52(1).

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), Handbook of language acquisition. Vol. 2 : Second language acquisition (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic.

Nyikos, M. (1991). Prioritizing student learning: A guide for teachers. In L. Strasheim (Ed.), Focus on the foreign language learner: Priorities and strategies (pp. 25-39). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Omaggio, A. C. (1984). The proficiency-oriented classroom. In T. Higgs (Ed.), Teaching for proficiency, the organizing principle (pp. 43-84). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Park, D-J. (1996). Yeonge gyoyukkwajeongui kaypal [Towards developing English curriculum]. English Teaching, 51(1)

Schachter, J. (1988). Second language acquisition and its relationship to Universal Grammar. Applied Linguistics, 9, 219-235.

Schachter, J. (1990). Communicative competence revisited. In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins, & M. Swain (Eds.), The development of second language proficiency. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (1994). Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. College composition and communication, 31, 378-388.

Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century (pp. 27-

34). Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, 1996.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. The Modern Language Journal, 82, 320-337.

Tarone, E. (1983). On the variability of interlanguage systems. Applied Linguistics, 4, 142-163.

Taylor, D. (1988). The meaning and use of the term 'competence' in linguistics and applied linguistics. Applied Linguistics,9, 148-168.

Yun, H-S. (1999). The place of grammar in English composition. English Teaching, 54(1).

Class size: 15-20

Time: 150 minutes

Week 1: Language learning and teaching

Objective: Students will acquire a preliminary understanding of what language teaching and learning mean, as well as become familiar with theories of psychology that have affected language teaching.

The focus of the first week is on introducing Korean EFL teachers and graduate students (Korean EFL teachers, henceforth) to what language learning and teaching mean. Given that language teaching cannot be separated from language learning, the introduction will be of service to Korean EFL teachers to whom the relationship between language teaching and language learning needs to be made clear. In general, since EFL teachers' job is to facilitate EFL learners moving toward successful learning of English by directing and promoting their learning as well as setting the conditions for

EFL learners to follow, coverage of the relationship between teaching and learning turns out to be important. This point is particularly significant in that all classroom practices, teaching styles, methods, and techniques a teacher adopts will eventually depend on an EFL teacher's philosophy or perception of teaching and of how EFL learners are engaged in learning.

An explanation of the influences of theories of psychology and general linguistics on language teaching and learning is in order. This discussion starts with the impacts of behavioral psychology on the field of language education and shows how linguistic theories such as structural (or descriptive) and cognition-based approaches have affected language education. Terms such as langue and parole (Saussure, 1916) are understood in terms of underlying language system and its surface realization, respectively. The distinction between langue and parole gives rise to parallel distinctions such as those between competence and performance (Chomsky, 1965), between competence and proficiency (Taylor, 1988), and between declarative and procedural knowledge (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). However, the term competence has not been used in a consistent way among linguists and applied linguists. A brief account of inconsistent uses of this term is useful at the beginning of the course.

Activity: Korean EFL teachers will engage in a group activity in which they experience what behaviorists' classrooms and cognitivists' classrooms look like in terms of language learning and teaching. For this activity, EFL teachers in each group are asked to come up with the characteristics of behavioral and cognition-based classrooms. The activity is designed to let them get a preliminary picture of how theories apply to language teaching and learning in the classroom setting.

Week 2: Theories of first language (L1) acquisition

Objective: Korean EFL teachers will be able to understand theoretical approaches to L1, as well as the limitations of each of these perspectives, through discussions on those theories that have implications for an understanding of L2/FL learning principles.

The class will cover theories of L1 acquisition. Research studies on L1 acquisition are useful to EFL teachers because some of the research findings in L1 acquisition can offer them an opportunity to draw analogies between L1 and L2/FL learning. Such analogies can be used to justify certain teaching techniques and methods in terms of the principles of L1 acquisition (Brown, 1994)

Theoretical approaches to L1 such as a behavioristic approach, a nativist approach, and a functional approach are covered, along with the explanations of important terms in each approach. Discussions center around an overview of theoretical perspectives of L1 acquisition and the limitations of the respective position. Eventually, the implications of the issues for L2/FL learning on the basis of L1 learning principles help Korean EFL teachers grasp an understanding of L2/FL learning principles. Schachter (1988) recognized this, pointing out the legitimate similarities between L1 and L2 which teachers may use to draw some constructive conclusions from L1 acquisition to L2/FL learning, despite the inconsistent relationship found between L1 and L2 learning.

A behavioristic approach to L1 acquisition claims that practice based on repetition and association is crucial to habit formations by operant conditioning. This perspective leads to a heavy emphasis on rote memory and practice by paying attention to surface forms in language learning. Thus, meaningful and contextualized communicative aspects of language learning are totally excluded, which make this

approach an inappropriate one for L2/FL learning.[5]

The nativist approach to L1 acquisition assumes that every child is born with the innate ability to learn a language. Given the innateness hypothesis, researchers from the nativist perspective have recently expanded the LAD proposition that all human beings are genetically equipped with language-learning capabilities. They further expand the notion of LAD to seek for a system of linguistic universals referred to as Universal Grammar (UG). However, the nativist approach to language acquisition with focus on the LAD notion and UG presents many issues in terms of L2/FL learning. Those issues include the nature vs. nurture controversy, decontextualized communication, and exclusions of affective and cultural influence on language learning.

Functional approaches posit that language is one representation of general development of the human mind. Thus, the functional position finds it meaningless to separate a cognitive aspect from an affective aspect in the account of language. This perspective challenges the nativist framework of language acquisition which underscores the competence level of the idealized speaker-hearer at an abstract and formal level. Functional approaches emphasize the importance of the functional aspects of language use or performance. Thus, the functionalists aim to investigate the relationships between linguistic forms and linguistic functions in terms of language development.

Weeks 3-5: Theories of second language (L2) acquisition

Objective: Korean EFL teachers will be able to familiarize themselves with theories of L2 learning and to get guidance for the integration of some of the theories into their

---

[5]Mikulecky pointed out that the repetition could be of meaningful phrases when used in functional communicative contexts.

teaching practice.

Three weeks are devoted to the coverage of theories of L2 learning. Among many theoretical perspectives of L2 leaning which emphasize the importance of contextualized input and output (Shrum & Glisan, 1994), the following theories are introduced: (a) Krashen's input hypothesis; (b) the variable competence model; (c) Long's interaction hypothesis; (d) Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development; (e) the interlanguage theory; (f) Swain's output hypothesis.

First, Krashen's (1982) input hypothesis is associated with acquisition, not learning. The input hypothesis claims that acquisition occurs only when learners understand input language that contains structure a little beyond their current level of competence with the aid of context or extralinguistic information. The notion of comprehensible input is crucial to the input hypothesis. It suggests that classroom learners should be given the optimal comprehensible input (i + 1) which is not grammatically sequenced and which they find interesting and challenging to make progress without their being put "on the defensive" (p. 129).

Second, the variable competence model was developed by Bialystok (1982), Ellis (1986), and Tarone (1983). In conceptualizing L2 acquisition, Bialystok hypothesized a two-dimensional model in which analysis and automaticity can interact. According to her, mental representation can be unanalyzed or analyzed. At one end of this knowledge dimension, "unanalyzed knowledge is the general form in which we know most things without being aware of the structure of that knowledge" (p. 183). At the other extreme, we are overtly aware of the structure of analyzed knowledge. She further distinguishes automatic processing from non-automatic processing. When learners have easy and fast access to knowledge retrieval, it is called automatic. When

learners need more time and effort to retrieve knowledge, it is called non-automatic. Based on Bialystok's analysis and automaticity, Ellis makes another distinction between planned and unplanned discourse in which learners are engaged in certain situations. Planned discourse involves less automaticity and more analysis, whereas unplanned discourse concerns more automaticity and less analysis. An individual learner may show a complete mastery of a certain structure in some situations, but the same learner may not exhibit full control of the structure in other situations. Ellis emphasizes the importance of the negotiation of meaning in unplanned discourse in L2 acquisition process. In explaining individual variation in different discourse situations, the variable competence model postulates that language learning occurs through the use of a continuum between conscious, analytic processes and subconscious, automatic processes. Thus, learners may use automatic processes in unplanned, spontaneous discourse contexts, or they may activate non-automatic processes in consciously planned discourse situations.

Third, Long's (1996) updated version of the interaction hypothesis claims that interaction facilitates L2 development, and that learners must actively be engaged in conversations in which they interact or negotiate meaning with their conversational partners to help overcome communication breakdowns. Long also places emphasis on the negotiation of meaning as Ellis does in the L2 acquisition process. According to this hypothesis, L2 learners modify and restructure their interaction when communication breakdown occurs. Long's perspective is that the activities of negotiation for meaning lead L2 learners to learning, given that activities offer learners comprehensible input (Swain & Lapkin, 1998).

Fourth, Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) stresses the

importance of social interaction, when applied to L2 acquisition process. Vigotsky's (1978) ZPD is "the distance between actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers" (p. 86). With respect to L2 acquisition, ZPD suggests that acquisition may occur, depending on cooperative and meaningful interaction, with a plethora of contextualized input (Shrum & Glisan, 1994).

Fifth, interlanguage theory attaches importance to L2 learners' production before they fully acquire language. Thus, systematic variation shown in L2 learners' output is considered to be valuable. Research on interlanguage shows that there is a predictable order in which certain linguistic structures are produced (Gass & Selinker, 1994). Gass and Selinker enumerate several types of systematic variation based on L2 learners' output: linguistic variation; social context relating to L1; social context relating to interlocutor, task type, and conversational topic.

Sixth, the output hypothesis by Swain (1985) stresses the role of output. The gist of her theory is that output: (a) pushes L2 learners to seek other means for getting a message across in a time of communication breakout; (b) pushes L2 learners to impose syntactic structure on their utterances; (c) lets L2 learners test language rules they formulated concerning the L2.

Activity 1: Based on Krashen's (1982) requirements for optimal input, students in groups are engaged in evaluating "Grammar Translation Method," followed by presentations of their work. As an assignment, individual students write up the results on the evaluation of Grammar Translation Method.

Requirements for optimal input

1. Comprehensible
2. Interesting/relevant
3. Not grammatically sequenced
4. Quantity
5. Filter level ("off the defensive")
6. Provides tools for conversational management (p. 127)

Activity 2: Using other theories, EFL teachers in groups are engaged in discussing those theories and in coming up with some teaching guidelines for employing those theoretical approaches with Korean EFL students.

Weeks 6-8: Communicative language teaching

Objective: Korean EFL teachers will be able to grasp a sound understanding of communicative competence and to recognize the importance and use of contextualized EFL teaching. The purpose is to help Korean EFL students become language learners with communicative competence.

Given that current EFL teaching practices in Korea do not incorporate these approaches to enhance learners' communicative competence (or proficiency), we cannot overemphasize the importance of communicative language teaching. For this purpose, the following topics pertinent to communicative language teaching are covered here: (a) a definition of communicative competence and the models; (b) introduction of the organizing principles for FL learning (ACTFL national standards); (c) contextualized EFL teaching.

Communicative competence

The term "communicative competence" was coined by Dell Hymes, a sociolinguist who criticized Chomsky's competence model as too limited, since the model was based on the rule-governed creativity of an ideal speaker. The criticism led

to Hymes' argument that speakers acquire not only a system of grammar and rules but also a system of use, regarding persons, places, purposes, and other modes of communication. Given the emphasis on the social and functional use of language, communicative competence can be defined as "competence that enables us to convey and interpret messages and to negotiate meanings interpersonally within specific contexts" (Brown, 1994, p. 227). The following definition in Savignon (1983) also contains a provision of learning situations to give L2 learners opportunities for the negotiation of meaning.

> Functional language proficiency; expressions, interpretations, and negotiation of meaning involving interaction between two or more persons belonging to the same (or different) speech community (communities), or between one person and a written or oral text (p. 303).

Another conceptual scheme of communicative competence was established by Canale and Swain (1980). This definition was further elaborated later by Canale (1983). The construct of communicative competence by Canale was broken down into four components:

1. grammatical competence (mastery of the language code)
2. sociolinguistic competence (appropriateness of utterance with respect to both meaning and form)
3. discourse competence (mastery of how to combine grammatical forms and meanings to achieve unity of a spoken or written text)
4. strategic competence (mastery of verbal and non-verbal communication strategies used to compensate for breakdowns in communication, and to make communication more effective) (pp. 9-10).

Schachter (1990) questioned the validity of the constituent components in Canale (1983), based on the following two issues: the separation of sociolinguistic and discourse competence; construct underspecification. Based on Schachter's critique on Canale's four-component model of communicative competence, Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, and Thurrell (1995) proposed a five-component model of communicative competence with

specification of each competence :

1. linguistic competence (sentence patterns and types, the constituent structure, the morphological inflections, and the lexical resources, as well as the phonological and orthographic systems needed to realize communication as speech or writing)
2. strategic competence (knowledge of communication strategies and how to use them)
3. sociocultural competence (the speaker's knowledge of how to express messages appropriately within the overall social and cultural context of communication, in accordance with the pragmatic factors related to variation in language use)
4. actional competence (matching actional intent with linguistic form based on the knowledge of an inventory of verbal schemata that carry illocutionary force)
5. discourse competence (the selection, sequencing, and arrangement of words, structures, sentences and utterances to achieve a unified spoken or written text).

Introducing the organizing principles for FL learning(ACTFL national standards)

In order to provide Korean EFL teachers with opportunities to examine the organizing principles used in developing the standards for FL education and to evaluate their practices in terms of those principles, ACTFL national standards for FL learning are introduced. In addition, Korean EFL teachers will be able to examine the extent to which the aforementioned definitions of communicative competence is reflected in the ACTFL standards for FL learning. More specifically, the following three organizing principles are introduced: (a) the broad goals of language instruction; (b) the curricular elements necessary for the attainment of the standards; (c) the framework of communicative modes.

For this purpose, primary emphasis is placed on how current EFL education in Korea reflects those principles. The goals of language instruction are discussed in terms of "five c's of foreign language education. Those five c's are communication, culture, connections, comparisons, and communities.

The curricular elements needed for FL instructions are: language system; communication strategies; cultural content; learning strategies; content from other subject; critical thinking skills; technology.

Three modes in which communication is characterized are: interpersonal; interpretive; presentational. Each mode has a close connection between language and culture.

Contextualized EFL teaching

In light of the importance of the role context plays in language learners' ability to process a foreign language and in their enhancing communicative competence, Shrum and Glisan's (1994) contextualized language instruction is equated with communicative language teaching. In order to get Korean EFL teachers familiar with communicative approach to language teaching to apply this approach in their classroom through organizing content and unit plans, several options are discussed.

First, given that current EFL teaching in Korea is characterized by decontextualized grammar teaching and text translation, the following two approaches to grammar teaching such as traditional bottom-up teaching and recent top-down or whole language approach to language instruction are introduced for illustrative purposes. In particular, for EFL learners to be active participants in the learning process, grammar teaching should be designed so that classroom activities can encourage interaction and the functional use of English by affording EFL learners opportunities to share information, ask questions, and collaborate with peers to solve problems, with the use of integrated, contextualized, and meaning-centered language tasks.

Second, in order to give Korean EFL teachers a concrete understanding of communicative language teaching, two models related to the design of course syllabus are discussed: functional syllabus and task-based syllabus.

Third, concurrent with the current trend of underscoring learner-centered curriculum development (Nunan, 1988) and recognizing the importance of learning strategies which are perceived as "an integral part of language programs, providing students with the tools for a lifetime of learning" (Standards for foreign language learning (ACTFL). p. 30), discussion of learner-centered curriculum and traditional teacher-centered curriculum follows. More specifically, learner-centered curriculum process will be explained to Korean EFL teachers, on the basis of Nunan's model of curriculum process.

Activity: Korean EFL teachers will engage in group work. In this activity, they examine national standards for EFL learning issued by the Ministry of Education in Korea in light of the ACTFL national standards and communicative language teaching.

Assignment: Based on the discussion of Canale and Swain (1980), Canale (1983) and Celce-Murcia et al. (1995), EFL teachers are asked to individually write a reflection paper. The paper should include a section on the degree to which he or she is engaged in communicative language teaching in their own work.

*Week 6: For the teaching activity scheduled on Weeks 10-11, EFL teachers are informed of the details on this activity through a guide sheet and the instructor's modeling of a sample lesson.

Week 9: Teaching learning strategies

Objective: Korean EFL teachers will be able to have an awareness of the importance

of teaching learning strategies and learner-centeredness in their teaching practice.

Despite the ever-increasing concerns with the role learning strategies play in second or foreign language learning, current EFL education in Korea is indifferent to teaching learning strategies to learners. In EFL learning situations, learning strategies as tools "make language learning more effective, rapid, and enjoyable" (Nyikos, 1991). Stressing the importance of language learning strategies is congruent with learner-centered approach to language teaching. Teaching learning strategies to EFL students helps make them more active English learners while engaging them in tasks that require interaction and negotiations with their teachers and peers, leading to moving them toward more communicative competence.

Given the lack of Korean EFL teachers' awareness of or indifference to learning strategy instruction, this week covers the topic of learning strategy instruction in EFL settings with a view to prompting Korean EFL teachers to take learning strategy teaching into serious consideration in the interests of their students' language development. Coverage of this topic ranges over the following, based on Nyikos (1991) and Chamot and O'Malley (1994): (a) the importance of learning strategies; (b) research findings on the effectiveness of learning strategies; (c) learner-centeredness vs. language learning strategies; (d) benefits to learners and relevance to teachers; (e) learning strategy types; (f) ways to identify students' strategy use; (g) ways to teach learning strategies.

Assignment: Korean EFL teachers are asked to find out what learning strategies their students have employed using one of the ways to identify the strategies. This assignment is to be written and turned in to the instructor.

*Details on the final group project (no more than 3 EFL teachers) for the course are

discussed, with a list of possible topics offered by the instructor.

Weeks 10-11: Teaching activity

Objective: Korean EFL teachers will be able to teach their EFL students using communicative language teaching, with its stress on contextualized EFL instruction.

A pair of Korean EFL teachers are engaged in a 20 minute teaching activity.[6] The purpose of this activity is to let each of the Korean EFL teachers have an opportunity to apply what is covered in terms of communicative language teaching to their classrooms and to get familiar with contextualized language instruction. EFL teachers have the freedom to focus on vocabulary, pronunciation, syntax, or grammar. For this activity, EFL teachers are held responsible for designing and presenting their EFL teaching with the provision of a lesson plan.

The lesson plan should cover information on the following criteria:
(a) level of EFL students (for this course, the level should be intermediate or above); (b) the object of the lesson (what you would like your students to be able to do by the end of the teaching activity); (c) specification of cultural context or situation (including tasks congruent with a cultural situation in which your students are supposed to be); (d) list of authentic materials needed; (e) sequence of activities (brief statements of the steps such as a presentation phase, a practice phase, a follow up phase in presenting your teaching); (f) a way to assess students' learning; (g) future step for the continuation of this lesson.

After the teaching activity, Korean EFL teachers are required to submit their

---

[6]This activity is based on my personal experience and the teaching activity information sheet by Nyikos (1997) in L520 Advanced study of foreign language teaching.

lesson plan and reflection paper to the instructor. Both should be typed and in English. Two copies of the reflection paper are handed in (one copy to the instructor; the other for use in peer editing session on Week 14). Evaluation of the respective teaching activity and related documents is made on the basis of the following criteria: (a) clarity; (b) the degree of colleagues' involvement; (c) representation of a cultural context; (d) the extent to which communicative aspects are emphasized; (e) demonstration of sequencing the steps above.

Week 12: Teaching listening and reading

Objective: Korean EFL teachers will be able to understand both reading and listening as active processes that should be incorporated into productive skill areas in communicative language teaching.

Korean EFL teachers are given opportunities to extend their perspectives on teaching the receptive skills of listening and reading. Based on current theoretical frameworks which stress the importance of communicative competence in listening and reading (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992), listening and reading processes are conveyed to Korean EFL teacher as active processes that call for interaction between various types of knowledge. Thus, it is emphasized that teaching reading and listening should be blended into teaching the other skills such as speaking and writing in terms of improving balanced language ability.

Given the dichotomy of top-down and bottom-up skills in traditional reading and listening processes, they are both introduced to Korean EFL teachers. However, concurrent with current view of reading and listening processes, the focus is on addressing both top-down and bottom-up skills which interact in listening and reading

processing (Scarcella & Oxford, 1992; Dubin, Eskey, & Grabe, 1986).

Research on the variables related to comprehension is introduced to Korean EFL teachers in order to provide opportunities to consider those variables in their practices. Those variables are (a) EFL learners' background knowledge; (b) strategies used by EFL learners in the comprehension tasks; (c) purpose for reading and listening or the nature of the task; (d) text length; (e) type of text; (f) treatment of new vocabulary (Shrum & Glisan, 1994).

In teaching the receptive skills, the use of authentic materials is discussed. Many research findings suggest that L2 learners exposed to authentic materials increase comprehension in reading and listening. Furthermore, the use of authentic materials in EFL classrooms serves as a source of cultural contexts, helping learners integrate reading and listening with culture.

An interactive model of teaching the receptive skills, which was proposed by Shrum and Glisan (1994), is introduced to Korean EFL teachers. The model consists of six stages with emphasis on (a) listener/reader use of text meaning, (b) listener/reader use of text language, and (c) class activities. The six stages in the model are: (a) pre-listening /pre-reading; (b) identifying main elements; (c) identifying details; (d) organizing/revising main ideas/details; (e) recreating text; (f) reacting to text/exploring intertextuality.

Week 13: Teaching speaking

Objective: Korean EFL teachers will be able to explore ways for their EFL students to improve oral proficiency by becoming familiar with communicative language teaching, cooperative language learning activities, and teaching group interaction skills, by recognizing the importance of providing students with opportunities to use English

in a variety of contexts.

Traditionally, EFL classes in Korea are not devoted to improving learners' oral proficiency. Mechanical analysis of grammar structures and translation are definitely a barrier to students' speaking skill. Given this, we need to explore ways to improve Korean EFL students' speaking skill by engaging them in more communicative activities. Such activities should be interesting, meaningful, and interactive ones that can provide opportunities for EFL students to speak in a variety of authentic tasks and contexts with authentic materials and to develop cultural awareness by doing so.

In particular, the emphasis should be on meaning rather than on form at least in the beginning stages. As Savignon (1983) noted earlier, "The development of the learner's communicative abilities is seen to depend not so much on the time they spend rehearsing grammatical patterns as on the opportunities they are given to interpret, to express, and to negotiate meaning in real-life situations" (p. vi). Similarly, Omaggio (1984) also emphasizes the importance of: (a) providing learners with opportunities to practice using the language in a wide range of contexts; (b) encouragement of learners to express meaning as early as possible in classroom; (c) promotion of active interaction among peers; (d) authentic language use in teaching; (e) understanding of the target culture.

Importantly, speaking skill should be integrated with other skills, just as other skills should be connected to speaking skill. In light of these considerations, it is almost impossible to expect our EFL students to interact with themselves for developing speaking skill in a large class size. A solution to this problem is to conduct cooperative learning activities in which students are most likely to encounter in real-life situations. EFL students in pairs or in small groups engage in tasks designed to help themselves

develop communicative competence by interacting with peers and by focusing on meaning rather than on accuracy. Additionally, cooperative learning activities in EFL classes have the effect of students' teaching themselves how to ask questions and negotiate meaning in their endeavor to reach reciprocal comprehension and understanding.

Class discussion of this week focuses on: (a) types of cooperative learning activities; (b) issues on grouping students; (c)teaching group interaction skills; (d) structuring group tasks. This will be followed by a discussion of ways to provide feedback on students' errors in speaking. Lastly, the way speaking skill is integrated into other skill areas is illustrated.

Week 14: Teaching writing

Objective: Korean EFL teachers will be able to recognize that writing develops in stages and that writing instruction should be blended into other skill areas for a balanced language development. They will also become familiar with peer editing.

In Korean EFL classes, writing is often regarded as translating Korean sentences into English ones, or combining a couple of simple English sentences into a complex sentence using given rules of sentence combination. One's writing skill in EFL is measured by how well one translates into English without grammatical errors. The tradition emphasizing grammatical accuracy in writing has prevented Korean EFL learners from freely expressing their ideas in a variety of ways, let alone learning to write in English as a continuous process toward writing proficiency. In this vein, Korean EFL teachers need to shift their attention to more meaning-centered approaches to EFL writing. They must also recognize that writing is not judged by the

sole criterion of grammatical accuracy based on sentence translation, but by the message conveyed, at least in the initial stages of writing. For Korean EFL learners to develop their writing skills, current discussion on EFL writing instruction centers around the following several points which are concurrent with current trend in writing instruction as well as with foreign language teaching.

First, writing develops in stages. Based on the communicative competence model (Carnale & Swain, 1980), Scarcella and Oxford (1992) suggest that efficient FL learners show the four components of communicative competence. Such a view is consistent with research on writing in English as L1 (Sommers, 1980). Skilled writers go through several continuous stages to get ideas developed and conveyed in contrast with unskilled writers. Thus, Korean EFL teachers need to perceive writing to be a process leading to a product rather than a single product. Second, EFL teachers' attention is directed toward peer editing as part of the revision process. Peer editing serves as an effective way to integrate writing skill with other skills, since EFL learners can have opportunities to exchange ideas (feedback) and negotiate meaning through interactions with peers in authentic learning situations. Third, many of the research studies on the effects of teachers' error correction on learners' progress indicate that minimal markings on learners' writing are more effective than heavy error correction. The use of heavy error correction strategy may frustrate both EFL learners and teachers themselves, eventually impeding progress in writing on the parts of learners (Haswell, 1983; Omaggio, 1986). More importantly, the point to be reemphasized is that Korean EFL teachers need to familiarize themselves with the process-oriented approach to writing and to be willing to implement the approach in their teaching practices.

Activity: Using the unmarked reflection papers from the previous teaching activity session, Korean EFL teachers work in small groups of less than four to provide feedback on the papers written by peers. This activity is to show a slice of process-oriented approach to writing in the hope that they will try in their classrooms.

Week 15: Assessment of EFL learner performance

Objective: As an alternative to summative testing or discrete point tests, Korean EFL teachers will be able to become familiar with assessing students' English proficiency in a holistic way and to create tests that assess students' English performance in such a way.

Korean EFL learners have been evaluated on the basis of their performance on tests, mostly consisting of multiple-choice test items, a few translation-related test items, or listening comprehension check-up questions. These tests focused on one linguistic component at a time are all discrete point tests in which the English language is partitioned into grammar, morphology, phonology or syntax. Meaningfulessness and decontextualization are often characteristic of such tests, since they do not contain test items designed to holistically test learners' performance in connection with other skill areas. Furthermore, the evaluations on Korean EFL learners have depended on summative tests. Under very few circumstances have Korean EFL learners been provided with opportunities to be tested on their ability to use various components of English in simultaneous, integrative, or holistic ways.

In this regard, Korean EFL teachers are given the opportunity to explore a variety of alternatives to summative testing or discrete point tests. Such alternatives will be useful in testing EFL students, while Korean EFL teachers are interacting with their students who perform interactive and contextualized language tasks. Class

discussion covers topics of: (a) types of test; (b) test design or test blueprint; (c) introduction of an interactive model of testing; (d) alternatives to traditional tests.

Activity: Korean EFL teachers in a group of four create sample tests that integrate more than two skill areas and culture within a certain language task. Later, one teacher in each group reports on their tests to the whole class.

Week 16: Group presentation and wrap-up

Two weeks are allocated for class presentations of each group' project. The purpose of group project is for Korean EFL teachers to become aware of the importance of their practices in terms of the needs of Korean students learning English in classroom settings. What EFL teachers propose as strategies, plan or problems will be valuable resources to EFL curricular reform and pre-service teachers' training program. During the presentation, peer feedback and evaluation are strongly encouraged.

References

Bialystok, E. (1982). On the relationship between knowing and using linguistic forms. Applied Linguistics, 3, 181-206.

Brown, H. D. (1994). Principles of language learning and teaching (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J. C. Richards & R. W. Schmidt (Eds.), Language and communication (pp. 2-27). New York: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1, 1-47.

Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6, 5-35.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Chomsky, N. (1965). Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Dubin, F., Eskey, D. E., & Grabe, W. (1986). Teaching second language reading for academic purposes. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ellis, R. (1986). Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (1994). Second language acquisition: An introductory course. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Haswell, R. H. (1983). Minimal marking. College English, 45, 600-604.

Kim, S-K. (2000, January 24). Yeonesilryeki kyengjayngryekita [English as essential to coping with international competitions]. The Dong-A Ilbo.

Krashen, S. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1989). Language acquisition and language education. New York: Prentice Hall International.

Lartigue Jr., C. J. (2000, May 28). You'll never guess what South Korea frowns upon. The Washington Post, p. B02.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), Handbook of language acquisition. Vol. 2 : Second language acquisition (pp. 413-468). New York: Academic.

MacDonald, S. (2000, February 15). Kyoyuk yelki ilryu, pangpepeun samryu [Education in Korea: Concern with education and its method]. The Dong-A Ilbo.

Nunan, D. (1988). Learn-centered curriculum. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nyikos, M. (1991). Prioritizing student learning: A guide for teachers. In L. Strasheim (Ed.), Focus on the foreign language learner: Priorities and strategies (pp. 25-39). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Omaggio, A. C. (1984). The proficiency-oriented classroom. In T. Higgs (Ed.), Teaching for proficiency, the organizing principle (pp. 43-84). Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Company.

Omaggio, A. C. (1986). Teaching language in context. Boston, MA: Heinle Heinle.

O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). Learning strategies in second language acquisition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Park, C-E. (2000, April 12). Malum maknun oykuke kyoyuk kaesenul [On Improving FL education towards oral communication]. The Dong-A Ilbo.

Saussure, F. (1916). Cours de linguistique générale. (Course in general linguistics. Trans. by W. Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959)

Savignon, S. J. (1983). Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Scarcella, R. C., & Oxford, R. L. (1992). The tapestry of language learning. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Schachter, J. (1988). Second language acquisition and its relationship to Universal Grammar. Applied Linguistics, 9, 219-235.

Schachter, J. (1990). Communicative competence revisited. In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins, & M. Swain (Eds.), The development of second language proficiency. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shrum, J. L., & Glisan, E. W. (1994). Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Sommers, N. (1980). Revision strategies of student writers and experienced adult writers. College composition and communication, 31, 378-388.

Song, K-C. (2000, May 1). Kwaoi munjeyui hyapep [A solution to extreme private schooling]. The Joongang Ilbo.

Standards for foreign language learning: Preparing for the 21st century (pp. 27-34). Lawrence, KS: Allen Press, 1996.

Stern, H. (1983). Fundamental concepts of language teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S. M. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), Input in second language acquisition (pp. 235-253). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1998). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. The Modern Language Journal, 82, 320-337.

Tarone, E. (1983). On the variability of interlanguage systems. Applied Linguistics, 4, 142-163.

Taylor, D. (1988). The meaning and use of the term 'competence' in linguistics and applied linguistics. Applied Linguistics,9, 148-168.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.